



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/547,191	04/11/2000	Anil Nori	50277-0370.	4144

7590

03/12/2002

Hickman Palermo Truong & Becker LLP
1600 Willow Street
San Jose, CA 95125-5106

EXAMINER

COLBERT, ELLA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED: 03/12/2002

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

MM

170

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/547,191	NORI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ella Colbert	2172	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 and 26-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 & 26-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-24 and newly added claims 26-35 are presented for examination. Claim 25 has been cancelled in this communication filed 12/27/01, entered as amendment D, paper no. 17.
2. Applicants' amendment to claims 7, 19, and 24 overcomes the 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph rejection and the 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph rejection is hereby withdrawn.
3. Applicants' formal drawings filed 12/27/01 have been reviewed and approved by the Examiner.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: Amended claim 7, page 1, line 3, recites "reading a first set of data from one or more fields of a plurality rows from a set of one or" would be better written as "reading a first set of data from one or more fields of a plurality of rows from a set of one or". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kroenke et al (US 5,809,297), hereafter Kroenke.

With respect to claim 1, Kroenke teaches, reading data from one or more rows of the set of one or more tables, (col. 28, lines 44-60 and col. 32, lines 21-27), and presenting data from one or more rows as an object having an object id (col. 29, lines 12-30). Kroenke did not explicitly teach, rows of the set of one or more tables or generating an object id based on values from the one or more rows in col. 6, lines 24-51, col. 28, lines 61-67, col. 29, lines 1-11, and fig. 1, fig. 2, and fig. 3, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have one or more rows and to generate an object id in view of Kroenke's teaching of value attributes and object ID's and to modify in Kroenke because such a modification would allow Kroenke's system to have a relational database consisting of tables of rows and columns defining a relationship between things in each row including one or more object attributes employed by users for identifying object instances.

With respect to claim 2, generating an object id based on values from one or more rows of a relational table that belongs to the set of one or more tables (col. 29, lines 12-45).

With respect to claim 3, the step of generating a reference to the object based on the object id (col. 29, lines 46-67 and col. 30, lines 1-5).

With respect to claim 4, Kroenke did not explicitly teach, the step of accessing the object based on the reference generated for the object, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify in Kroenke because such a modification would allow generation of the object

based on a reference because objects have unique identifiers depending on how the users view their data.

With respect to claim 5, receiving a request to define a view (col. 4, lines 29-54), the request specifying one or more columns of the set of tables containing values used to generate the object id (col. 29, lines 12-30), in response to receiving the request to define the view, storing specification data that specifies one or more columns (col. 30, lines 6-19), and the step of generating an object id based on values from the one or more rows includes determining how to generate the object id by inspecting the specification data (col. 11, lines 67 and col. 29, lines 1-45).

With respect to claim 6, Kroenke did not explicitly teach, receiving a request to define a view includes receiving a request that specifies the one or more columns as including at least one column from a relational table, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receive a request to define a view to include receiving a request specifying one or more columns including at least one column from a relational table and to modify in Kroenke because such a modification would allow Kroenke's database servers to manage the relational tables defining data types and to present a view of the data in the database to a user of the object types.

With respect to claim 7, reading a first set of data from one or more fields of a plurality of rows from a set of one or more tables (col. 28, lines 44-60 and col. 32, lines 21-27), generating a column object based on the first set of data (col. 28, lines 61-67, col. 29, lines 1-30, and figures 1, 2, and 3) and presenting a second set of data from one or more tables as an object having a column object as an attribute (col. 30, lines 6-65). Kroenke did not explicitly teach, rows in the set of one or more tables, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to have rows in the one or more tables and to modify in Kroenke because such a modification would allow Kroenke's system to have a set of data values aligned horizontally in a table and to arrange items horizontally within a type of framework.

With respect to claim 8, the step of reading data from one or more rows includes reading data from one or more rows of at least one relational table (col.1, lines 33-45).

With respect to claim 9, Kroenke did not explicitly teach, the step of generating a column object includes generating a collection object, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a step that generates a column object that includes the generation of a collection object and to incorporate in Kroenke because such a modification would allow Kroenke's system to generate an object that contains an object type which is well known in the art.

With respect to claim 10, Kroenke did not explicitly teach, the step of generating a collection object includes generating the collection object as a list of elements belonging to a single data type, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a step that generates a collection object that includes the generation of a collection object as a list of elements belonging to a single data type and to modify in Kroenke because such a modification would enhance Kroenke's system to have each row as a value and each column to identify an object type such as a person or a child attribute of the object type which can be a collection data type and represent one or more children of a person.

With respect to claim 11, Kroenke did not explicitly teach, the step of generating a collection object includes generating the collection object as a nested table, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a step that generates a collection object that includes the generation of a collection object as a nested table and to incorporate in Kroenke because such a

Art Unit: 2172

modification would allow Kroenke's system to have data types within an object table enabling the modeling of one to many relationships among the objects.

With respect to claim 12, the step of generating a column object includes generating a column object belonging to a user specified object type (col. 31, lines 39-49).

With respect to claim 13, the step of generating a column object includes generating a column object that is a reference to another object (col. 31, lines 50-65).

With respect to claim 14, Kroenke did not explicitly teach, the step of generating a column object includes generating a column object that is a reference to an object presented by an object view, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a step that generates a column object that includes the generation of a column object that is a reference to an object presented by an object view and to modify in Kroenke because such a modification would allow a class to be mapped to a view and to create a new view in the relational database which incorporates the definitions of one or more views.

With respect to claim 15, the step of generating a column object includes generating a column object that is a reference to an object residing in a database (col. 4, lines 55-67 and col. 5, lines 1-7).

With respect to claim 16, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

Kroenke teaches, a processor (col. 8, lines 11-14), a memory coupled to the processor (col. 8, lines 11-14), a set of one or more tables, the set of one or more tables containing one or more rows (col. 1, lines 32-45).

With respect to claim 17, Kroenke did not explicitly teach, the values from the one or more rows includes values from one or more rows of a relational table that

Art Unit: 2172

belongs to the set of one or more tables, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the values from the one or more rows include values from one or more rows of a relational table that belongs to the set of one or more tables and to incorporate in Kroenke because such a modification would allow Kroenke's system to have values that define the relations in the one or more rows of a relational table belonging to one or more tables. Kroenke teaches in col. 1, lines 35-36, relational databases consist of one or more two-dimensional tables that contain numerous rows and columns and each row of the relational table defines a record of the data.

With respect to claim 18 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 5.

With respect to claim 19, a processor (col. 35, lines 33-34 and col. 40, line 46), a memory coupled to the processor (col. 35, lines 34-36 and col. 40, lines 47-49), one or more databases (col. 1, lines 16-45), a set of one or more tables contained in the one or more databases (col. 1, lines 55-67 and col. 2, lines 1-8), the processor configured to read a first set of data from a plurality of rows from the set of one or more tables (col. 28, lines 44-60 and col. 32, lines 21-27), the processor configured to generate a column object based on the first set of data (col. 28, lines 61-67, col. 29, lines 1-30, and figures 1, 2, and 3), and a processor configured to represent a second set of data from the set of one or more tables as the object that has the column object as an attribute (col. 29, lines 14-30 and col. 30, lines 42-65). Kroenke did not explicitly teach, a plurality of rows, one or more databases, a set of one or more tables contained in the one or more databases directly in response to the other two claim limitations, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a plurality of rows, to have one or more databases, and a set of one or more tables contained in one or more databases because relational databases consist of one

Art Unit: 2172

or more two-dimensional tables that contain numerous rows and columns and each row of the relational table defines a record of the data.

Kroenke did not explicitly teach a processor configured to read data, to generate a column object, and to represent a second set of data, but it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a processor configured to perform these steps because Kroenke's computer system contains a sequence of program instructions that when executed by the central processing unit cause the performance of the functions of reading the data, generating a column object, and representing a second set of data (col. 35, lines 8-67, col. 36, lines 1-67, col. 37, lines 1-67, and col. 38, lines 1-8).

With respect to claim 20 this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1. A computer-readable medium is well known in the art as a disk or CD ROM, etc. for containing information that can be interpreted and acted on by a computer.

With respect to claim 21 this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 2.

With respect to claim 22, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 5.

With respect to claim 23, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 6.

With respect to claim 24, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 7.

With respect to claim 26, Kroeke teaches a computer-readable medium (col. 35, lines 34-36) to perform the steps of claims 24 and 26.

This dependent claim is also rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 8.

With respect to claim 27, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 9.

With respect to claim 28, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 10.

With respect to claim 29, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 11.

With respect to claim 30, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 12.

With respect to claim 31, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 13.

With respect to claim 32, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 14.

With respect to claim 33, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 15.

With respect to claim 34, Kroenke teaches generating a reference to the object based on the object id (col. 6, lines 33-39).

With respect to claim 35, accessing the object based on the reference generated for the object (col. 14, lines 4-13 and col. 19, lines 1-14).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicants' arguments filed 12/27/01 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' argue: the art cited by the examiner fails to teach anything about presenting data in relational tables as object oriented data has been considered but is not persuasive because the claim limitation presenting data in relational tables as object oriented data is not found in Applicants' claim language in claims 1-24 and 26-35.

Applicants' argue: Kroenke discusses nothing about how the data is actually stored in the tables is converted and presented as data from another paradigm has been considered but is not persuasive because Applicants' claims 1, 16, and 20 do not have in the claim limitations that the data actually stored in tables is converted and presented as data from another paradigm. The Examiner does not interpret the claim limitations of claims 1, 16, and 20 as suggesting or disclosing the data actually stored in tables is converted and presented as data from another paradigm.

Applicants' argue: Kroenke fails to make obvious any system that allows data stored in rows of tables of a database to be presented as object oriented data has been considered but is not persuasive because the claim limitations of claims 7, 19, and 24 do not have the claim limitation any system that allows data stored in rows of tables of a database to be presented as object oriented data. The claim limitations of claims 7, 19, and 24 do not mention that the data is stored in rows of tables of a database to be presented as object oriented data. The Examiner does not interpret the claim limitations of claims 7, 19, and 24 as suggesting or disclosing a system that allows data stored in rows of tables of a database to be presented as object oriented data.

Applicants' appear to not be claiming the subject matter which Applicants' regard as their invention.

Applicants' argue: the Kroenke reference fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1, 16, 20 has been fully considered but is not persuasive because in this rejection of claim 1 and others, for example under Section 103 (a) of Title 35 of the United States Code, the Examiner carefully drew up a correspondence between the Applicants' claimed limitations and one or more referenced passages in the Kroenke reference, what is well known in the art, and what is known to one having ordinary skill in the art (the skilled artisan). The Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the Specification (see below):

2111 Claim Interpretation; Broadest Reasonable Interpretation [R-1]

>CLAIMS MUST BE GIVEN THEIR BROADEST REASONABLE INTERPRETATION

During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).<

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Genus*, 988 F.d. 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is (703)308-7064. The examiner can normally be reached **Monday through Thursday from 6:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST.**

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu, can be reached on (703)305-4393.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703)746-7238 for After-Final communications

Or:

(703)746-7239 for Official communications or (703)746-7240 for

Non-Official communications.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121

Crystal Drive, Arlington, Virginia, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2172

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.



E. Colbert

March 7, 2002



HOSAIN T. ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER